

The Principia.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1860.

THE LATE CONVENTION AT CHICAGO.

The Republican Convention at Chicago, has come and gone. It is difficult to say whether its results have been such as to excite surprise in the minds of the honest and disinterested Conventionists at Charleston. The Democrats succeeded in nominating nobody;—the Republicans, in nominating one of whose nomination nobody had before dreamed. Of the Democrats at Charleston, it may be said that they put forward a question of fundamental principle, a national policy,—of the righteousness at Chicago, they stood upon the one and loss of the more realistic candidate, the most available, because the least known, the least genuine at the least discredited or discreditable among those to be selected. On one point there seems to be a coincidence. Douglas could not be nominated because he was the leader of his party. Nor Seward, because another man had done as much as himself for his party.

That Seward and Douglas are each the embodiment of his party, respectively, the nation well knows. That both of them have, for the present, been thwarted in their aspirations, because of that fact, is equally well known. Time was, when the ablest exponent of the principles and measures of his party, was considered the Presidential Candidate of the party of course, without the force or the importance of a National Nominating Convention. The time has come, in which he who does the most to expound and vindicate the principles and measures of his party, is, of course, precluded from receiving the votes of his party, by the machinery of a nominating Convention.

Between Douglas and Seward there is this difference—the friends of the former stood by their principles in standing by him, though at the expense of losing the prospects of the victory and the spoils. Seward's friends abandoned him, not to say their principles, if they had any, for the prospects of winning the election. That there were two rival elements at Chicago, as at Charleston, a conservative and an aggressive, cannot be doubted; but in the one case, it produced a separation, in the other it was smothered or compromised, yet not without a yielding on the part of the progressive. Old foginess carried the day. Greeley and *The Tribune* prevailed—not indeed by the nomination of Bates—we doubt whether that was expected—but by the defeat of Seward, the grand object in view.

Seward challenges public sympathy, as a wronged man. Every one sees that he is ill-used. We confess our sympathy is chilled by the belief that he has, himself, played a game. His "irrepressible conflict" speech at Rochester was to elect Morgan by drawing off votes from Gerrit Smith, and thus keeping his party in this State in working order for the Presidential election; and his labor had, at the time, its expected reward. His speech in the Senate was to counteract the effects of his Rochester speech, and secure his nomination by the politicians, the former to secure his election by the people. As his nomination failed, his efforts failed with it, of course. This was his risk, and is *his* loss, his misfortune. Like others who have calculated that they have missed a figure. Like others who have been skillful in riding two horses but have lost a last fall between them. We have fewer tears to shed for the abolitionists who have wildly speculated upon future glories, due to the mischance that was visited, and the precious interests that are in process of being wrecked by them.

We have spoken of Mr. Greeley's influence at Chicago. But the influence of James Gordon Bennett of the *New York Herald* has been forgotten, or at least his. Greeley's. It has, in fact, lost the *Herald*, that by its incessant harping upon Seward, "the higher law," the "irrepressible conflict," the "body Resolves speech," the treasonable conspiracy "Harpers Ferry" and "John Brown," has enraged the slaveholders, alarmed the slave-savers, and impressed Mr. Greeley with the apprehension that the nomination of Seward would defeat the Republican party. Thus Bennett has virtually ended *The Tribune*, and the result is before us. But all in vain! *The Herald* now identifies

itself with Seward, and it leaves on the Republican party prospects not as promising by dropping Seward. But does not this withdrawal of support from those who believed Seward to be more of an abolitionist than they could see evidence of his being? We know little of Lincoln, but have no apprehensions that all those at Charleston, has lost any thing by the change, either conscious or unconscious, of a decision in the party leaders, to vote for a more extreme candidate. It is remarkable that with a man of such freedom of opinion, and such a name as the *Herald* has, who have been identified with the Republican nomination, and who have successfully showing that the Presidential majority of the party should lay in the second instance, if necessary, where should they be? When another first ran on the flag of Freedom, he boasted that he would compel the "black Republicanism" to follow suit. They laughed at him, but within a week or two of the Philadelphia Convention, when they fulfilled its prophecy, allowed him, notwithstanding, to boast of it and gladly welcomed his editorial assistance. Now, he bids them pull down the flag of Seward and down it comes! What he will next bid them do, we will not conjecture.

The nomination of Lincoln will counteract the nominations of Polk and Pierce. Everybody is surprised. "Who is he?" On the return of some of the delegates who nominated Polk, the assembled democracy of a certain country village through which they were to pass, hailed them by the inquiry, "Who have you nominated?" "James K. Polk." "Huzza!" and up went the hats. "Just the man, exactly!" The stage was passing on, when they hailed, a second time, with, "What did you say his name is?" We have said we know little of Lincoln. But if any of our Republican friends should look into *The Principia* for information, we can tell them thus much. *Abram Lincoln's* name met our eye for the first time, within our memory, the time since the election of Mr. Buchanan, when he was standing in Lincoln, as the Republican candidate for U. S. Senator, in opposition to Stephen A. Douglas, the Democratic candidate after Horace Greeley and his Tribune had been trying to dissuade the Republicans of Illinois from running any opposition to Douglas, the Anti-Leopold candidate on the ground that Anti-Leopoldism Democrats and Republicans were pretty nearly one and the same. We remember how Mr. Lincoln, in his stump speeches and debates with Douglas, poured contempt upon the negroes and the abolitionists, in order to distance his rival, and lost his election by the Legislature, after all, tho' it was claimed that he had the largest popular vote. This with the reading of his speech at Cooper Institute, and the reports of his speeches in Connecticut, is about all we know of the statesmanship and public life of Mr. Lincoln, except what *The Tribune* has told, since the nomination, which amounts to little, except that he had been a member of the Legislature of Illinois, and for a short time, of Congress.

Seriously, it is not humiliating to think that our Presidents are designated for us by delegations of professional politicians whose only questions are, which candidate will get the most votes with our assistance? Which will encounter the least opposition? Which of them has so little hold upon the intelligent respect, the confidence, and the affections of the people that, when elected, he will feel his obligations to us for his election, and divide between us the offices in his gift? Within a short time the *Times*, the *Tribune*, the *Herald*, and many other leading, representative papers of different parties have truthfully exposed the rotteness of the system of National Nominating Conventions, predicting and hoping that they would soon be laid aside. As in our Chicago Convention we see the influence of these same Journals at work, to make them the nuisances they have been, and to lead us to use them for their worst work.

And when we come to look for a higher standard of political action, to see that men have actually, irrespective of names, characters, or principles, in the selection of candidates, to be voted for. Even *The Independent* that reads lectures, *The Tribune* in this subject draws its arguments from the larger set that might be gained by selecting the best man.

What honesty is the best policy may be a less disabbling maxim than its opposite. That honesty is better than policy would be a far more useful and truthful one. But it would be "fantastical, ideal and impracticable" we suppose, to propose such a rule.

When will Christians, at least, send their Bibles, and learn that "He that saith every man must be just, ruling in the fear of God,"—executing judgment between a man and his neighbor,—delivering from that which is spoiled, out of the hand of the oppressor,—breaking every yoke,"—letting the oppressed go free,"—promising liberty unto every one that will, and will be the children thereof." When will they take to their own—Judges and lawyers shall still make laws, but the great power that Lord the world shall be the Christian, the true and that shall bring the world into the kingdom. When will they learn from the thousands, the promulgators of the "higher law," that an "irrepressible conflict of future generations" is not what we should fear, but for the perfection of society, men who hold the hands of politicians, after some great crime, and so the hands with opposition.

CHANGE IN THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

We publish to day, the REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, adopted recently, at Chicago together with the statement by *The Tribune*, of the principal points of difference between this and the Philadelphia platform of 1856. The two are published side by side in parallel columns. In *The Tribune*, but we have room only for the new one. We have compared them, and find the *Tribune's* statement essentially correct, but think it proper to call attention, more distinctly, to the importance of these changes.

1. The Platform of 1856, while it silently dropped the "Free Soil" motto of "No more slave States" did not distinctly say, as Republican orators and Editors have so frequently said since, that the party was ready to admit new slave States, whenever they presented themselves with constitutions approved by the people, establishing or recognizing slavery.

2. The Platform of 1856, though, after having pledged the party "the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence,"—in its specification of measures, it applied these principles to the exclusion of slavery from the Territories only, omitting to mention the States, did not distinctly disclaim, as Republican orators and editors have so frequently disclaimed since, any intention of applying these principles for the abolition of slavery in the States. Col. Fremont's letter, did indeed contain such a disclaimer, but Abolitionists voting for him, would not admit that they voted for his disclaimer, because they said it was not contained in the Platform! It was a lame excuse, to be sure, but they made it do, for want of a better.

But the new Platform of 1860, adopted at Chicago, throws aside ambiguity, and makes a clean breast of the matter, so far as applying the principles of the Declaration of Independence to the States for the abolition of slavery is concerned. The "Constitution of the United States"—in the presence of slavery—is made to dwarf itself down into a constitution for "the Territories." The fourth resolution will be found to order that ground perfectly. "The right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions (not excepting slavery) is distinctly affirmed, as a right"—"essentially" to the balance of power, &c. &c. making slavery, as Gov. McDuffie said, "the corner stone of our Republican edifice."

By the same resolution, and by the same language (since no discrimination between old and new States," is even hinted at), "the right of a new State to come into the Union with slavery is. With sufficient distinctness, a needed truth. The fullness the prediction of radical abolitionists, years ago—and for which they were derided, as impracticable—has now those who conceded the "irrepressible conflict" of the old States to new slave States, will ultimately be recognized in the right of new States to come into the Union with slavery.

All this agrees well with the past and present action of *The Tribune*, and with Republican prospects in Congress generally. It puts a veto upon the "cause of peace" of those who voted Republican, but not abolitionists, and those who have been authorized by the party, to be excluded in its Platform. This cannot be said, nor can we unceremoniously cast the blame, pacified with this pass. Something else must be devised, or the party divided.

In 1856, it was a grave question among the leaders of the party whether the "K. W. Nothing," or "Native American" creed should not be incorporated into the Platform,

